

“The Plan”

-
- Requisites for establishing the U.S. as the preferred (acceptable?) host country for a linear collider:
 - Establish credibility of the U.S. as a reliable partner
 - Secure and dependable (U.S.) budgets
 - Minimal Congressional and DOE interference
 - Willingness to adapt to recognized international standards and to waive rules.
 - Non-politicization of the site
 - Develop confidence within the world scientific community that they will be welcome
 - Access to the U.S. (visas)
 - Exceptions on job permits (spouses)
 - ⇒ Potential show stopper in current climate
 - Establish Fermilab leadership role on linear collider.
-

“The Plan”

-
- Requisites for establishing Fermilab as the preferred host lab for a linear collider:
 - Establish Fermilab/Illinois capability to serve as host lab/region for a linear collider, both in reality and in perception.
 - Technical ability
 - Organizational/management capabilities
 - Excellent site
 - Intellectual leadership
 - Enthusiasm for the role
 - Understand the parameters associated with the host lab role.
 - Relationship between Fermilab and the international “entity”
 - What part of the ongoing program are we willing to sacrifice, and on what timescale?
 - Establish support from our neighbors, state and local governments, local universities/laboratories, U.S. community.
-

“The Plan”

Plan elements

We suggest that a strategic plan for establishing Fermilab as the preferred host lab requires the following elements:

- Commitment and leadership at the highest levels of Fermilab management to establish Fermilab as the preferred host.
- Develop Fermilab capability to provide technical leadership on the LC construction project.
 - Engagement in the critical accelerator technology issues and demonstration project(s). Suggest identifying a limited number (two) of areas in which to concentrate accelerator physics effort with goal of establishing leadership, e.g.
 - Damping ring
 - Main linac

“The Plan”

Plan elements

- Assume leadership and host the technology demonstration project.
 - Complete a design study for warm and cold versions of ETF on the timescale of the technology decision.
 - Understand connection to the Proton Driver following the technology selection.
- Target R&D within a limited number of areas which are deemed critical to detector performance, and in which we have special capabilities. Such R&D should include collaborators from the US and abroad. Examples:
 - Vertexing and Tracking
 - Calorimetry
 - Muons
 - Test beams

“The Plan”

Plan elements

- Identify a preferred Illinois site and develop a site plan.
 - Establish collaborations with local institutions and state/local governments.
 - Retain close collaboration with broader U.S. community on CA sites.
- Establish a realistically achievable timeline for construction and operations (in concert with the USLCSG and ILCSG).
- Strengthen Fermilab presence within the LC collaboration(s)
- Maintain a strong Fermilab presence within the USLCSG and ILCSG (and their successors).

“The Plan”

Plan elements

- Develop an outreach plan addressing the following constituencies
 - Local communities
 - State government
 - The Fermilab staff
 - Local universities and laboratories
 - Could include
 - Follow-up to public opinion survey in ~2005
 - Follow through on community task force
 - Integrate university programs into the LC accelerator R&D program.
 - Strengthen coupling between Fermilab strategic planning and activities of ICAR and NICADD.
 - Connect to other mid-western universities
 - Strengthen ties with ANL in projects of mutual interest.
 - Work within the USLCSG (and ILCSG) on outreach to national (and international) scientific communities.
-

“The Plan”

Plan elements

- Establish a model for interaction between Fermilab as host lab and the international project consistent with the evolving view of the international community.
 - Define the preferred relationship between Fermilab (as host lab) and the international project organization. Includes:
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - Authorities
 - Scope of work Fermilab would imagine undertaking
 - Determine the correct balance between the ongoing research program and the linear collider facility during both the construction and operations phases.
 - What fraction of Fermilab resources need to be devoted?
 - What would the non-LC research program then look like?

“The Plan”

Resource Requirements

- Current budget is ~\$4M
- Needs to rise to ~\$20M by the time host lab is selected (2006? 07?)
 - Roughly 80% of this should be going to accelerator and siting studies
- To ~\$100M by the time of construction start (assuming Fermilab is host lab)
 - Staff effort should be in proportion
- Somewhat less ($\frac{2}{3} \times \$100M?$) if U.S. is host country, but Fermilab not host.
- Less again ($\frac{1}{3} \times \$100M?$) if U.S. is not host country.

“The Plan”

Prototype Recommendations

Disclaimer: Recommendations not yet endorsed by the full FLRPC.

Assuming Fermilab wishes to vie for the position of linear collider host laboratory we recommend the following steps:

- 1) Adopt as policy that Fermilab wishes to be host lab to the linear collider.
- 2) Establish coordination at the Directorate level for formulation of “The Plan” to achieve this.
- 3) Execute “the plan” with Directorate coordination
 - Address suggested elements listed above (plus those we haven’t thought of)
 - Be prepared to devote significantly enhanced resources
 - Rising to ~\$20M/year at the time of host lab selection.
 - Rising to ~\$100M/year at the time of construction start.
 - Establish the fallback position if LC does not come to Fermilab

Conclusions and (Personal) Opinions

- The opportunity to host a physics frontier facility comes rarely. We cannot “pass”.
 - Fermilab has a responsibility both to our staff, and to the national and international communities to establish ourselves as an excellent candidate for the LC host laboratory.
 - We should commit our laboratory to a plan that maximizes the likelihood of Fermilab becoming host lab.
 - Governance models similar to that described by Kalmus allow us to do this without holding the future of the laboratory hostage to a process (getting to a LC construction start) that may take a long time to culminate or may result in the LC being constructed elsewhere.
 - The development of a backup plan should not be interpreted as a lack of commitment.
-